

IN THE DRAWINGS

Replacement Sheets of drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are submitted herewith.

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are required.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ozugur (Pub No. US 2003/0202505, hereinafter Ozugur).

Claims 4-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozugur in view of Forslow (U.S. Patent 6,954,790, hereinafter Forslow).

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., just to avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, because a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously

depended from it. Therefore, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Objection to the Drawing

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are required. Replacement Sheets of drawings are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ozugur. The rejection is traversed.

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each and every element of the claimed invention arranged as in the claim. The Ozugur reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as arranged in independent claim 1.

Specifically, the Ozugur reference fails to teach or suggest at least “a cache for storing network data recently downloaded from a network...” as recited in independent claim 1.

Portions of the Ozugur reference cited by the examiner disclose an “ARP cache.” As known by a person of the ordinary skills in the relevant art, ARP – address resolution protocol – is a method for finding a node’s physical address when only its network address is known. ARP is primarily used to translate IP addresses to Ethernet MAC addresses. Therefore, the ARP cache is a table which stores mappings of such addresses. Accordingly, within the ordinary meaning of “ARP cache” and as disclosed by the Ozugur reference, ARP cache stores physical and network addresses and is used to find physical addresses to which packets should be transmitted. (See para [0021]). There is nothing in the portions cited by the Examiner expanding that ordinary meaning of “ARP cache.”

Such ARP cache is entirely different from the cache element of Applicants’ claim 1. As recited in claim 1, the cache stores network data, not just network or physical

addresses. It is evident from the Applicants' claims and specification that the network data can include anything that could be requested by a mobile node, for example, contents of web pages. (e.g., paras. [0117]-[0122]).

Further, the Ozugur reference discloses ARP cache as a part of the ARP server, which is not part of a gateway, but a separate element. (See para [0021], lines 5-6 figs. 1-2). In contrast, Applicants' claim 1 recites the cache element as part of the gateway. Accordingly, the Ozugur reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as arranged in Applicants' independent claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Ozugur and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Independent claims 9, 15, and 18 recite relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1 and, as such, and at least for the same reasons as discussed above, these independent claims also are not anticipated by Ozugur and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Because all of the dependent claims depending from the independent claims include all the limitations of the respective independent claim from which they ultimately depend, each such dependent claim is also allowable over Ozugur.

Therefore, Applicants' claims 1-3, 9-11 and 15-20 are allowable over Ozugur under 35 U.S.C. §102. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozugur in view of Forslow.

Each of these grounds of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and each is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Ozugur. Because the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 given Ozugur has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Forslow supplies that which is missing from Ozugur to render the independent claims anticipated, these grounds of rejection cannot be maintained.

Therefore, Applicants' claims 4-8 and 12-14 are allowable over Ozugur in view of Forslow under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/1/07



Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808